

Non-local on-shell field redefinition for the SME

Ralf Lehnert*

Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139

(Dated: September 22, 2006)

This work instigates a study of non-local field mappings within the Lorentz- and CPT-violating Standard-Model Extension (SME). An example of such a mapping is constructed explicitly, and the conditions for the existence of its inverse are investigated. It is demonstrated that the associated field redefinition can remove b^μ -type Lorentz violation from free SME fermions in certain situations. These results are employed to obtain explicit expressions for the corresponding Lorentz-breaking momentum-space eigenspinors and their orthogonality relations.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Cp, 11.30.Er, 12.60.-i

I. INTRODUCTION

Despite its numerous phenomenological successes, the framework of the Standard Model coupled to general relativity is not believed to provide a fundamental description of nature; it is rather viewed as the low-energy limit of some encompassing quantum theory in which the gravitational, strong, and electroweak interactions are unified. The energy scale of such an encompassing theory is expected to be of the order of the Planck mass $M_{Pl} \simeq 10^{19}$ GeV. This expectation presents an enormous experimental challenge because the emerging effects are likely to be suppressed by one or more powers of M_{Pl} at presently attainable energies. However, minute Lorentz and CPT breakdown has recently been identified as a promising signal in this context: such effects may arise in various approaches to fundamental physics, and they are amenable to ultrahigh-precision tests [1, 2].

The low-energy effects of Lorentz and CPT breakdown are described by an effective-field-theory framework called the Standard-Model Extension (SME) [3–5]. Besides the usual Standard-Model and Einstein–Hilbert actions, this framework contains all leading-order contributions to the action that violate particle Lorentz and CPT symmetry while maintaining coordinate independence. Of particular phenomenological interest is the minimal SME. In addition to conventional physics, it only contains those Lorentz- and CPT-violating terms that are expected to be dominant and satisfy a few other physically desirable requirements. The Minkowski-spacetime limit of the minimal SME has been the focus of various investigations, including ones with photons [6–9], electrons [10–12], protons and neutrons [13–15], mesons [16], muons [17], neutrinos [18, 19], and the Higgs [20]. Bounds in the gravity sector have also been obtained recently [21, 22].

The Lorentz- and CPT-violating coefficients in the minimal SME are non-dynamical background vectors and tensors, which are coupled to Standard-Model fields. They are assumed to be generated by underlying physics.

Various specific mechanisms for such effects have been proposed in the literature. For instance, mechanisms compatible with spontaneous Lorentz and CPT breakdown have been studied in models based on string theory [23, 24], noncommutative geometry [25], spacetime-varying fields [26, 27], quantum gravity [28], nontrivial spacetime topology [29], random-dynamics models [30], multiverses [31], and brane-world scenarios [32].

There are a number of known mappings between SME fields that relate different SME coefficients for Lorentz violation [3, 4, 9, 33]. In some cases, the effects of Lorentz breakdown can be moved from one SME sector to another. In other cases, the coefficient can be removed from the SME altogether implying it is unobservable. Moreover, for certain dimensionless Lorentz-violating parameters for fermions a spinor redefinition is needed to obtain a hermitian Hamiltonian. It therefore follows that such field redefinitions play an important role for the analysis of experimental Lorentz and CPT tests and for the interpretation of Lorentz violation in the SME. The form of possible field redefinitions is essentially only constrained by the requirement of invertibility. On one hand, this leaves a substantial amount of freedom in the identification of useful field redefinitions. On the other hand, the large number of possibilities hampers a systematic and comprehensive study of such redefinitions.

Previously analyzed mappings between SME fields fall into two categories [3, 4, 9, 33]: redefinitions of the field variables and coordinate rescalings. In both cases, the mapping is local and applies on- as well as off-shell. The present work is intended to launch an investigation of a set of field redefinitions characterized by non-locality. We will focus on a mapping within the SME’s free b^μ model that scales (and hence eliminates in a certain limit) the b^μ coefficient from this model. With the exception of special cases, the structure of the non-local mapping is such that only on-shell applicability is guaranteed.

Although the b^μ coefficient cannot be removed from a realistic interacting model, this field redefinition is nevertheless interesting for the following reasons. In many situations, the extraction of the physical content of a field theory, such as the SME, requires an initial investigation of its quadratic sectors. For instance, perturbation theory in quantum field theory typically amounts to an

*Electronic mail: rlehnert@lns.mit.edu

expansion about known free-field physics. Since our non-local field redefinition can be employed to establish a one-to-one correspondence between the usual free Dirac field and the non-interacting b^μ model, it can be used to gain insight into the free-field physics of this model. In particular, this idea allows a complete characterization of the solutions to the free b^μ model. The present work illustrates this with a specific example: the previously unknown b^μ eigenspinors are generated from the conventional ones via our non-local field redefinition. We finally remark that a generalization of this idea to the full SME, if possible, would completely characterize its free sectors.

The paper is organized as follows. A brief review of the b^μ model is given in Sec. II. Section III discusses the Pauli–Lubanski vector, which is an essential ingredient in our non-local field redefinition. In Secs. IV and V, the field redefinition is constructed and some of its properties including invertibility are established. Section VI employs these results for the determination of explicit expressions for the b^μ -model momentum-space eigenspinors. A summary and outlook is contained in Sec. VII. Throughout we employ the notation and conventions of Ref. [34].

II. REVIEW: FERMIONS WITH A $\gamma_5 \not{b}$ TERM

This section reviews various results derived in Ref. [3] on the relativistic quantum mechanics of spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fermions with a $\gamma_5 \not{b}$ term. The starting point is the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_b = \bar{\psi} \left(\frac{1}{2} i \overleftrightarrow{\not{D}} - m - \gamma_5 \not{b} \right) \psi, \quad (1)$$

where m is the fermion’s mass. The last term of this Lagrangian contains a nondynamical spacetime-constant vector b^μ . This vector coefficient has mass dimensions, and it explicitly breaks Lorentz and CPT symmetry. The ordinary Dirac Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_0$ is recovered for zero b^μ .

Lagrangian (1) has recently received substantial attention in Lorentz-violation research. It has been studied in the context of radiative corrections in Lorentz-breaking electrodynamics [7], finite-temperature field theory [35], as well as particle-decay processes [36], and it might be generated within the ghost-condensate model [27]. We also mention that experiments with spin-polarized matter have constrained the order of magnitude of b^μ to be less than 10^{-30} GeV for electrons [11]. Additional bounds of 10^{-27} GeV for both electrons and protons, as well as 10^{-31} GeV for neutrons have been obtained by clock-comparison tests [13]. The clean limit of 10^{-25} GeV on a component of b^μ for the electron has been extracted from Penning-trap experiments [10]. Under certain assumptions, the order of magnitude of b^μ is less than 10^{-20} GeV for neutrinos [18]. Throughout this work, we shall thus take $b^2 \ll m^2$.

The modified Dirac equation determined by Lagrangian (1) is

$$(i \not{D} - m - \gamma_5 \not{b}) \psi_b(t, \vec{r}) = 0, \quad (2)$$

which can be rearranged to give the Schrödinger equation $i \partial_0 \psi_b(t, \vec{r}) = H_b \psi_b(t, \vec{r})$ with the hermitian Hamiltonian

$$H_b = \gamma^0 (-i \vec{\gamma} \cdot \vec{\nabla} + m + \gamma_5 \not{b}). \quad (3)$$

We denote the space of solutions $\psi_b(t, \vec{r})$ to Eq. (2) by $\mathcal{S}_b$. In the $b^\mu = 0$ limit, the ordinary Dirac case with solutions $\psi_0(t, \vec{r})$ and solution space $\mathcal{S}_0$ emerges. For later convenience, we abbreviate the modified Dirac operator appearing above by

$$D_b \equiv i \not{D} - m - \gamma_5 \not{b}. \quad (4)$$

Reversing the sign of the mass term in D_b and applying the resulting operator from the left to Eq. (2) yields the following modified Klein–Gordon equation:

$$(\square + m^2 + b^2 + 2\gamma_5 \sigma^{\mu\nu} b_\nu \partial_\nu) \psi_b = 0. \quad (5)$$

With a second operator-squaring procedure, one can derive the following equation diagonal in spinor space:

$$[(\square + m^2 + b^2)^2 - 4b^2 \square + 4(b \cdot \partial)^2] \psi_b = 0. \quad (6)$$

A plane-wave ansatz $w(\lambda) \exp(-ix \cdot \lambda)$ for $\psi_b(x)$ in the above equation yields

$$(\lambda^2 - m^2 - b^2)^2 + 4b^2 \lambda^2 - 4(\lambda \cdot b)^2 = 0 \quad (7)$$

for the fermion’s dispersion relation. For any fixed wave vector $\vec{\lambda}$, this dispersion relation constitutes a quartic equation in the plane-wave frequency. We denote its four roots by $(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu = ((\lambda_a^\pm)^0(\vec{\lambda}), \vec{\lambda})$. These roots are associated with fermion (superscript +) and antifermion (superscript −) solutions, each with two possible spin states ($a = 1, 2$). In Sec. III, we will see that a labels spins parallel and antiparallel to b^μ . Explicit expressions for $(\lambda_a^\pm)^0(\vec{\lambda})$ are given in Appendix A. Jointly with Eq. (2), the dispersion relation (7) determines the corresponding eigenspinors $w_a^\pm(\vec{\lambda})$. Most analyses in this work do not require a full distinction between all the roots. For notational convenience, we then only display the necessary labels.

III. THE PAULI–LUBANSKI VECTOR

Up to the momentum-operator factor $\sqrt{P^\mu P_\mu}$, the Pauli–Lubanski vector W^μ is the relativistic generalization of a particle’s spin. For Dirac fermions, this vector is given in position space by [37]

$$W^\mu = \frac{1}{2} \gamma_5 \sigma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu. \quad (8)$$

Although Lorentz breakdown precludes the conservation of total angular momentum in the b^μ model (1), $W^\mu W_\mu = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2} + 1)\square$ is evidently conserved: its gamma-matrix structure is trivial, and so it commutes with H_b .

We remark in passing that this argument does not employ the modified Dirac Eq. (2). Hence, $[H_b, W^2] = 0$ is not only valid on solutions $\psi_b(t, \vec{r})$ but actually on any sufficiently well-behaved spinor $\psi(t, \vec{r})$. This essentially means that the Lorentz-violating b^μ interaction leaves unchanged the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ character of the particle ψ_b , as expected. Note that the above argument only uses the spacetime independence of the Hamiltonian. The result therefore generalizes to fermions with translation-invariant Lorentz violation in the full SME, which incorporates the minimal SME.

In the usual Dirac case, an analogous argument establishes the conservation of the individual spin components $\sim W^\mu$. In the present case, such an argument fails due to the absence of Lorentz symmetry. However, Lorentz transformations in the plane orthogonal to b^μ still determine a symmetry of the Lagrangian (1), leading us to investigate $W \cdot b$ as a candidate for a conserved spin component.

We begin by analyzing the eigenvalues of $W \cdot b$. Let $\chi \exp(-ix \cdot \lambda)$ be an arbitrary momentum eigenspinor that does not necessarily obey an equation of motion, i.e., both χ and λ^μ are unconstrained. Any eigenvalue Ω then satisfies $\det(-\frac{1}{2}i\gamma_5\sigma^{\mu\nu}b_\mu\lambda_\nu - \Omega) = 0$. We can obtain an explicit expression for the square of this determinant as follows. Note that $\det(M) = \det(CMC^{-1})$ for any M and any invertible C , so that $\det(M)^2 = \det(MCMC^{-1})$. In our case, $M = -\frac{1}{2}i\gamma_5\sigma^{\mu\nu}b_\mu\lambda_\nu - \Omega$. If now C is chosen to be the usual charge-conjugation matrix (e.g., $C = i\gamma^2\gamma^0$ in the Dirac representation), a diagonal expression for $MCMC^{-1}$ emerges. This yields a positive and a negative eigenvalue, both twofold degenerate:

$$\Omega_a = \frac{1}{2}(-1)^a \sqrt{(\lambda \cdot b)^2 - b^2 \lambda^2}, \quad (9)$$

where $a = 1, 2$. It follows that $W \cdot b$ and P^μ have simultaneous eigenstates $\chi_a(\lambda) \exp(-ix \cdot \lambda)$.

In order to employ the general result (9) within the b^μ model (1) and the ordinary Dirac case, we must still verify that $W \cdot b$ commutes with H_b and H_0 , respectively. As a first step, note that $[D_b, W \cdot b] = 0$. We remark in passing that this shows $W \cdot b \mathcal{S}_b \subset \mathcal{S}_b$, a necessary condition for our claim. Employing $D_b = \gamma^0(i\partial_0 - H_b)$ in this commutator gives after some algebra

$$[H_b, W \cdot b] = \gamma^0[\gamma^0, W \cdot b]D_b. \quad (10)$$

It is apparent that this commutator is in general nonzero, when it acts on arbitrary spinors $\psi(t, \vec{r})$. However, we only need $[H_b, W \cdot b] \psi_b(t, \vec{r}) = 0$ for all $\psi_b(t, \vec{r})$ satisfying Eq. (2), which is ensured by the presence of the Dirac operator D_b on the right-hand side of Eq. (10). Thus, on the solution space $\mathcal{S}_b$ we indeed have

$$[H_b, W \cdot b]_{\mathcal{S}_b} = 0. \quad (11)$$

A similar result holds for H_0 . We can therefore conclude that $W \cdot b$ is conserved. In particular, simultaneous

energy-momentum eigenspinors of $W \cdot b$ and H_b as well as simultaneous energy-momentum eigenspinors of $W \cdot b$ and H_0 exist. The eigenvalue formula (9) is thus applicable in the b^μ model (1) and in the ordinary Dirac case.

We may now employ the appropriate dispersion relations to reduce the general eigenvalue expression (9) in each of the two specific cases: for the b^μ model, the dispersion relation (7) yields

$$\Omega_a = \pm \frac{1}{4}(-1)^a(\lambda_a^2 - m^2 - b^2), \quad (12)$$

and for the usual Dirac field, $\lambda_a^2 = m^2$ gives

$$\Omega_a = \frac{1}{2}(-1)^a \sqrt{(\lambda_a \cdot b)^2 - m^2 b^2}. \quad (13)$$

Note that in the b^μ case the correspondence of the signs is left open. This issue can be resolved as follows. The last term in the modified Klein-Gordon equation (5) is equal to $4W \cdot b$. With this observation, the momentum-space version of Eq. (5) becomes

$$(\lambda^2 - m^2 - b^2 - 4W \cdot b)w(\lambda) = 0. \quad (14)$$

This fixes the sign ambiguity in Eq. (12), and one can now write

$$\Omega_a = \frac{1}{4}(\lambda_a^2 - m^2 - b^2) \quad (15)$$

for the eigenvalues of $W \cdot b$ in the b^μ model. We remark that this argument also provides an independent proof of the fact that the momentum eigenspinors of H_b are at the same time eigenstates of $W \cdot b$.

The gamma-matrix structure of $W \cdot b$ is determined by $\sigma^{\mu\nu}$. Only the σ^{jk} , where Latin indices range from 1 to 3, are hermitian, so the question arises as to whether $W \cdot b$ is observable, at least in principle. It can be answered with the help of the eigenvalues (13) and (15). For the b^μ model, the eigenvalues (15) of $W \cdot b$ are real because the hermiticity of H_b implies $\lambda^2 \in \mathbb{R}$. This is compatible with the observability of $W \cdot b$ in models with nonzero b^μ . For the ordinary Dirac field, only the second term under the square root in Eq. (13) together with a timelike b^μ can potentially lead to complex Ω_a . However, in a coordinate system in which $b^\mu = (B, \vec{0})$ one can verify that $\Omega_a^2 \geq 0$. It follows that also in the conventional Dirac model the eigenvalues of $W \cdot b$ are consistent with the observability of this operator.

Another question concerns the inverse of $W \cdot b$. There are situations in which $\Omega_a = 0$ and no inverse exists, for example, if λ^μ is parallel to b^μ . This issue is analyzed in more detail in Appendix B. But if we exclude such special cases, we can determine $(W \cdot b)^{-1}$. We begin by observing that $(\sigma_{\mu\nu}A^\mu B^\nu)^2 = A^2 B^2 - (A \cdot B)^2$ for any two 4-vectors A^μ and B^ν . Thus, in momentum space we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (W \cdot b)^{-1} &= \frac{-2i\gamma_5\sigma^{\mu\nu}b_\mu\lambda_\nu}{(\lambda \cdot b)^2 - \lambda^2 b^2} \\ &= \frac{4W \cdot b}{(\lambda \cdot b)^2 - \lambda^2 b^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

In position space, we formally write

$$(W \cdot b)^{-1} = \frac{4 W \cdot b}{b^2 \square - (b \cdot \partial)^2}, \quad (17)$$

where the action of the inverse derivative-type operator on any (well-behaved) position-space function in f is defined explicitly by

$$\frac{1}{b^2 \square - (b \cdot \partial)^2} f(x) \equiv \int d^4 y G(x - y) f(y). \quad (18)$$

Here, the Green function G is given by

$$G(x) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{d^4 \lambda}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{e^{-i\lambda \cdot x}}{(\lambda \cdot b)^2 - \lambda^2 b^2}, \quad (19)$$

as usual. If $(W \cdot b)^{-1}$ acts on function spaces on which it can become singular (i.e., $W \cdot b = 0$), the freedom in the choice of the contour $\mathcal{C}$ may be used to select certain boundary conditions. In the present work, we will only need to consider the action of $(W \cdot b)^{-1}$ on $\mathcal{S}_0$ or $\mathcal{S}_b$ for $b^2 \leq 0$. The discussion in Appendix B demonstrates that $(W \cdot b)^{-1}$ is nonsingular in these situations. Then, the contour simply runs along the real- λ^0 axis, and any ambiguities in the selection of $\mathcal{C}$ are absent.

Finally, consider $\int d^4 y G(x - y) \partial f(y) / \partial y^\mu$ and integrate by parts. If f falls off sufficiently fast and is sufficiently smooth, the boundary term can be dropped, we may trade $\partial / \partial y^\mu$ for $-\partial / \partial x^\mu$, and then pull this derivative outside the integral. This shows explicitly that $W \cdot b$ commutes with $[b^2 \square - (b \cdot \partial)^2]^{-1}$, as expected for two spacetime-independent expressions containing only the momentum operator. It follows that there are no ordering ambiguities in Eq. (17).

IV. THE b^μ -SHIFT OPERATOR $\mathcal{R}_\xi$

Our goal is to find an explicit representation of an operator $\mathcal{R}_\xi(x)$ that maps solutions of the b^μ model with coefficient b^μ to solutions of another b^μ model with shifted coefficient $b^\mu + \xi b^\mu$, where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. In other words, we seek an operator

$$\mathcal{R}_\xi : \mathcal{S}_b \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{b+\xi b}, \quad (20)$$

where the size (but not the direction) of b^μ is changed. Only when $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ acts on solutions of the usual Dirac equation $b^\mu = 0$, the above stipulation is meaningless and must be amended. In this special case, it is necessary to first select a b^μ vector that is nonzero but can otherwise be arbitrary. We then require $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ to generate solutions of a model with coefficient ξb_μ , so that $\mathcal{R}_\xi : \mathcal{S}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\xi b}$. For notational simplicity, we have suppressed the vector character of various subscripts.

Definition. An operator with the properties of $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ indeed exists:

$$\mathcal{R}_\xi(x) = \exp\left(-\xi x_\mu \vec{B}^{\mu\nu} \vec{\partial}_\nu\right), \quad (21)$$

where the projector-type quantity $\vec{B}^{\mu\nu}$ is given by

$$\vec{B}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{b^2 \eta^{\mu\nu} - b^\mu b^\nu}{2 W \cdot b}. \quad (22)$$

Here, the coefficient $b^\mu \neq 0$ is that of the space $\mathcal{S}_b$ the operator $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ acts on. The only exception, noted in the previous paragraph, is the special case $\mathcal{R}_\xi \mathcal{S}_0$, in which b^μ can be chosen freely. At this stage, the mathematical meaning of Eqs. (21) and (26) is somewhat vague. In the remainder of this section, we make the above definition more precise and establish key properties of $\mathcal{R}_\xi$.

The exponential in Eq. (21) is to be understood as a short-hand notation for the power-series expansion

$$\exp\left(-\xi x_\mu \vec{B}^{\mu\nu} \vec{\partial}_\nu\right) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left(-\xi x_\mu \vec{B}^{\mu\nu} \vec{\partial}_\nu\right)^n. \quad (23)$$

The derivative $\vec{\partial}_\nu$ in this expression is to be taken with respect to x_μ , the position-space variable. Since the commutator $[\vec{\partial}_\nu, x_\mu] = \eta_{\mu\nu}$ is nonzero and products of x and ∂ appear above, their order must be specified. A similar issue arises for $\vec{B}^{\mu\nu}$ and x_μ because $\vec{B}^{\mu\nu}$ contains the position-space expression for $W \cdot b$. In Eq. (23), the operator ordering is defined such that none of the derivatives and integrations are acting on the x_μ s. The n th term in the series looks therefore as follows:

$$\frac{\xi^n}{n!} \left(x_\mu \vec{B}^{\mu\nu} \vec{\partial}_\nu\right)^n \equiv \frac{\xi^n}{n!} \prod_{j=1}^n x_{\mu_j} \prod_{k=1}^n \vec{B}^{\mu_j \nu_k} \vec{\partial}_{\nu_k}. \quad (24)$$

Note that the operator order in the second product on the right-hand side of Eq. (24) is irrelevant: $\vec{B}^{\mu\nu}$ and derivatives commute since $W \cdot b$ and ∂ have simultaneous eigenstates. As a reminder for the ordering (24), $\vec{\partial}_\nu$ and $\vec{B}^{\mu\nu}$ carry arrows indicating the direction of action.

The definition of $\vec{B}^{\mu\nu}$ contains $(W \cdot b)^{-1}$, which may be singular in certain cases. Since $\vec{B}^{\mu\nu}$ appears always contracted with a 4-gradient, we may address this issue by considering $\vec{B}^{\mu\nu} \vec{\partial}_\nu$ instead. Also, our interest lies in mappings between models with parallel b^μ coefficients of different length, including the case $b^\mu = 0$. It therefore suffices to specify the action of the above combined operator on a complete set spanning $\mathcal{S}_b$ and $\mathcal{S}_0$. We select the set of plane-wave eigenspinors $\psi_a^\lambda(x) = w_a(\vec{\lambda}) \exp(-ix \cdot \lambda_a)$ of $W \cdot b$, where $a = 1, 2$ labels the eigenvalues of $W \cdot b$, as before. This gives

$$\vec{B}^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \psi_a^\lambda(x) = -i B_a^{\mu\nu}(\vec{\lambda}) (\lambda_a)_\nu \psi_a^\lambda(x), \quad (25)$$

where we have introduced the momentum-space version of $\vec{B}^{\mu\nu}$:

$$B_a^{\mu\nu}(\vec{\lambda}) \equiv (-1)^a \frac{b^2 \eta^{\mu\nu} - b^\mu b^\nu}{\sqrt{(\lambda_a \cdot b)^2 - b^2 \lambda_a^2}}. \quad (26)$$

To arrive at this result, we have used Eq. (9).

Note that $B_a^{\mu\nu}(\vec{\lambda})$ becomes singular, when the square root vanishes. In Appendix B, we show that this requires λ^μ to be parallel to a timelike b^μ : $(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu(\vec{\lambda}_0) = \zeta b^\mu$, where ζ is a dimensionless constant, $b^2 > 0$, and $\vec{\lambda}_0$ is the location of the singularity. The most natural and straightforward definition of $B_a^{\mu\nu}(\vec{\lambda}_0)$ would employ the limit $\vec{\lambda} \rightarrow \vec{\lambda}_0$ at the $W \cdot b$ singularity:

$$B_a^{\mu\nu}(\vec{\lambda}_0) \lambda_\nu \equiv \lim_{\vec{\lambda} \rightarrow \vec{\lambda}_0} B_a^{\mu\nu}(\vec{\lambda}) \lambda_\nu. \quad (27)$$

The remaining task is to determine the limit explicitly. This is simplified by working a coordinate system in which $b^\mu = (B, \vec{0})$. We can decompose any 4-momentum as $p^\mu = \lambda^\mu(\vec{\lambda}_0) + \varsigma b^\mu + \varepsilon u^\mu$, where ς and ε are parameters and $u^\mu = (0, \vec{u})$ obeys $u^2 = -1$. Employing this expression in definition (27) where we have to take $\varsigma, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ yields

$$B_a^{\mu\nu}(\vec{\lambda}_0) \lambda_\nu = (-1)^a |B| u^\mu. \quad (28)$$

Although this result is finite, the presence of u^μ indicates that the limit depends upon the path by which $(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu(\vec{\lambda}_0)$ is approached. This non-uniqueness means that an inverse of $W \cdot b$ is ambiguous for those states characterized at the beginning of this paragraph. Some results in the subsequent sections require $W \cdot b$ to be invertible, so that they are only valid when these states are excluded. Note, however, that this issue only arises for timelike b^μ and only for a subset of measure zero in the respective $\mathcal{S}_b$.

Useful properties. We next establish two basic properties of $\mathcal{R}_\xi(x)$. The first of these properties concerns the action of $\mathcal{R}_\xi(x)$ on plane-wave spinors $\psi_a^\lambda(x)$ introduced earlier. Starting from the power-series definition (23), it is apparent that the gradients $\vec{\partial}_\mu$ (including those in the denominator of $\vec{B}^{\mu\nu}$) can be replaced by $-i\lambda_\mu$ when acting on $\psi_a^\lambda(x)$. The resulting expression contains no longer derivatives, operator ordering becomes irrelevant, and the series can be summed:

$$\mathcal{R}_\xi(x) \psi_a^\lambda(x) = \exp(i\xi x_\mu B_a^{\mu\nu}(\lambda_a)_\nu) \psi_a^\lambda(x). \quad (29)$$

The second property concerns the derivative of $\mathcal{R}_\xi(x)$. Beginning again with the series (23), one can verify that

$$[\partial^\mu \mathcal{R}_\xi(x)] = -\mathcal{R}_\xi(x) \xi \vec{B}^{\mu\nu} \vec{\partial}_\nu. \quad (30)$$

This essentially means that the symbolic “exp” in Eq. (21) behaves as a true exponential with regards to differentiation. Note, however, that the operator ordering matters. One can also show that

$$\partial^\mu (\mathcal{R}_\xi \psi) = (\partial^\mu \mathcal{R}_\xi) \psi + \mathcal{R}_\xi (\partial^\mu \psi), \quad (31)$$

i.e., the usual product rule applies, as expected.

Proof of Relation (20). We are now in the position to establish the initial claim that $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ changes the magnitude of b^μ . It has to be verified that

$$D_{b+\xi b} \mathcal{R}_\xi \psi_b = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad D_b \psi_b = 0, \quad (32)$$

where D_b and $D_{b+\xi b}$ are Dirac operators defined by Eq. (4). We first use that $W \cdot b$ (which determines the gamma-matrix structure of $\mathcal{R}_\xi$) and $D_{b+\xi b}$ commute. Displaying the spinor indices c, d , and f for clarity, one obtains $(D_{b+\xi b})_{cd}(\mathcal{R}_\xi)_{df} = (D_{b+\xi b})_{df}(\mathcal{R}_\xi)_{cd}$. Since $D_{b+\xi b}$ contains the derivative $i\partial$, the product rule (31) generates an additional term when $(D_{b+\xi b})_{df}$ is moved past $(\mathcal{R}_\xi)_{cd}$. With the result (30) at hand, we then obtain

$$(D_{b+\xi b})_{df}(\mathcal{R}_\xi)_{cd} = (\mathcal{R}_\xi)_{cd}(D_{b+\xi b} - i\xi \gamma_\mu \vec{B}^{\mu\nu} \vec{\partial}_\nu)_{df}. \quad (33)$$

The position of the spinor indices is now such that we may convert back to matrix notation. Moreover, it can be verified that $i\gamma_\mu \vec{B}^{\mu\nu} \vec{\partial}_\nu = -\xi \gamma_5 \not{b}$ on any sufficiently well-behaved spinor $\psi(t, \vec{r})$. This finally yields

$$D_{b+\xi b} \mathcal{R}_\xi \psi_b = \mathcal{R}_\xi (D_{b+\xi b} + \xi \gamma_5 \not{b}) \psi_b = D_b \psi_b = 0, \quad (34)$$

where we have employed the modified Dirac equation $D_b \psi_b = 0$ in the last step. This demonstrates that

$$\mathcal{R}_\xi \psi_b = \psi_{b+\xi b}, \quad (35)$$

i.e., the operator $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ maps any solution of a model with Lorentz-violating coefficient b^μ to some solution of a model with coefficient $b^\mu + \xi b^\mu$.

V. INVERSE OF THE b^μ -SHIFT OPERATOR

Thus far, we have found that $\mathcal{R}_\xi \mathcal{S}_b \subset \mathcal{S}_{b+\xi b}$. The goal of this section is to sharpen this statement. We will establish that $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ determines, in fact, a one-to-one correspondence between the elements of $\mathcal{S}_b$ and those of $\mathcal{S}_{b+\xi b}$. Then, the inverse of $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ exists, and a number of useful insights and applications can be established. For example, certain properties and relations derived within a model with a specific b^μ coefficient can be mapped to analogous results for other models with more general b^μ .

The basic idea behind establishing the bijectivity of $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ is the following. Both the range $\mathcal{S}_b$ and the domain $\mathcal{S}_{b+\xi b}$ are spanned by the plane-wave eigenspinors of the respective Dirac equations. If we can show that for each eigenspinor in $\mathcal{S}_b$ there is exactly one eigenspinor in $\mathcal{S}_{b+\xi b}$, $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ is one-to-one. If we can further demonstrate that each $\mathcal{S}_{b+\xi b}$ eigenspinor can be obtained via this mapping, $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ is onto, and the claim follows. We will establish this result in three steps. In the first step, we show that eigenspinors are, in fact, mapped to eigenspinors. The second step verifies that $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ does not mix the four branches of eigenspinors. This roughly means that particles (antiparticles) are mapped to particles (antiparticles) such that their spin state is left unaffected. As the final third step, we demonstrate that for each of the resulting four maps between branches the plane-wave momentum is mapped one-to-one and onto.

Eigenspinors are mapped to eigenspinors. Let $\psi_a^\lambda(x) = w_a^b(\vec{\lambda}) \exp(-ix \cdot \lambda_a)$. Here, the spinor superscript b refers to the b^μ case. With Eq. (29), one can establish

that $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ inserts an additional plane-wave exponential into the expression for ψ_a^λ :

$$\mathcal{R}_\xi \psi_a^\lambda = w_a^b(\vec{\lambda}) \exp(i\xi x_\mu B_a^{\mu\nu}(\lambda_a)_\nu) \exp(-ix \cdot \lambda_a). \quad (36)$$

Combining the exponentials shows that

$$(\Lambda_{a'})^\mu \equiv (\lambda_a)^\mu - \xi B_a^{\mu\nu}(\lambda_a)_\nu \quad (37)$$

must be interpreted as the new plane-wave momentum. Since $(\lambda_a)_\mu$ satisfies the dispersion relation (7), $(\Lambda_{a'})^\mu$ is constrained as well: one can verify that it also satisfies Eq. (7), but with b^μ replaced by $b^\mu + \xi b^\mu$, as expected.

We next use the fact (35) that $\mathcal{R}_\xi \psi_a^\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_{b+\xi b}$, which gives

$$[i\partial - m - (1 + \xi)\gamma_5] w_a^b(\vec{\lambda}) \exp(-ix \cdot \Lambda_{a'}) = 0. \quad (38)$$

It therefore follows that in addition to its defining relation $[\lambda_a - m - \gamma_5] w_a^b(\vec{\lambda}) = 0$, the momentum-space spinor $w_a^b(\vec{\lambda})$ also obeys $[\Lambda_{a'} - m - (1 + \xi)\gamma_5] w_a^b(\vec{\lambda}) = 0$. But this is the definition of $w_{a'}^{b+\xi b}(\vec{\lambda})$. We therefore have

$$w_{a'}^{b+\xi b}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{R}_\xi w_a^b(\lambda), \quad (39)$$

where $\Lambda_{a'}$ and λ_a are related by Eq. (37). The above results lead to the conclusion that $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ maps plane-wave eigenspinors of $W \cdot b$ for a model with coefficient b^μ into those for a model with coefficient $b^\mu + \xi b^\mu$. The proof that the map $\mathcal{R}_\xi : \mathcal{S}_b \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{b+\xi b}$ is a bijection is now reduced to the following. We have to show that each plane-wave eigenspinor in $\mathcal{S}_b$ corresponds to exactly one plane-wave eigenspinor in $\mathcal{S}_{b+\xi b}$ and that this correspondence is onto.

Branches are mapped to branches. Any solution space $\mathcal{S}_b$ contains four distinct branches of eigenspinors labeled by the sign of the plane-wave frequency $(\lambda_a^\pm)^0(\vec{\lambda})$ at large wave vectors [40] and the sign of the $W \cdot b$ eigenvalue Ω_a . In other words, there are the usual particle and antiparticle solutions, each with two possible spin projections along b^μ , as discussed in Sec. II. In what follows, we will show that $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ maps branches to branches without mixing them. More precisely, the image of an $\mathcal{S}_b$ branch lies on one and only one $\mathcal{S}_{b+\xi b}$ branch; the images of any two distinct $\mathcal{S}_b$ branches belong to distinct $\mathcal{S}_{b+\xi b}$ branches. To this end, we need to investigate the behavior of the sign of $(\lambda_a^\pm)^0(\vec{\lambda})$ and the sign of Ω_a under the mapping $\mathcal{R}_\xi$.

We first consider the sign of the plane-wave frequency. Its behavior under $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ is determined by Eq. (37). For timelike b^μ , we immediately find difficulties. The projector-type quantity $B_a^{\mu\nu}$ appearing in Eq. (37) contains $(W \cdot b)^{-1}$, which may not exist for certain $\vec{\lambda}$, as discussed in Sec. IV. For lightlike b^μ , on the other hand, such issues are absent. Equation (37) reduces to

$$(\Lambda_{a'}^\pm)^\mu = (\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu - (-1)^a \text{sgn}(b \cdot \lambda_a^\pm) \xi b^\mu. \quad (40)$$

Up to a sign, $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ just adds the constant vector b^μ to $(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu$. For large $\vec{\lambda}$, we thus have $\text{sgn}(\Lambda_{a'}^\pm)^0 = \text{sgn}(\lambda_a^\pm)^0$, which justifies the $\pm$ label on $(\Lambda_{a'}^\pm)^\mu$.

For spacelike b^μ , we may select coordinates such that $b^\mu = (0, \vec{B})$. Then, Eq. (37) becomes

$$(\Lambda_{a'}^\pm)^\mu = (\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu + (-1)^a \xi \frac{\vec{B}^2 (\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu - (\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{B}) b^\mu}{\sqrt{(\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{B})^2 + \vec{B}^2 \lambda_a^{\pm 2}}}. \quad (41)$$

The second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (41) has the structure $(\lambda_a^\pm)_\nu \epsilon^{\mu\nu}$, where we have defined the tensor

$$\epsilon_{\mu\nu} \equiv (-1)^a \xi \frac{\vec{B}^2 \eta^{\mu\nu} + b^\mu b^\nu}{\sqrt{(\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{B})^2 + \vec{B}^2 \lambda_a^{\pm 2}}}. \quad (42)$$

The $\pm$ label on $(\Lambda_{a'}^\pm)^\mu$ is justified, if the components of $\epsilon^{\mu\nu}$ are small compared to 1. The dispersion relation (A2) yields

$$\lambda_a^{\pm 2} = m^2 + B^2 + 2(-1)^a \sqrt{m^2 B^2 + (\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{B})^2}. \quad (43)$$

Then, the minimum of the square root in Eq. (42) is given by $|\vec{B}|(m + (-1)^a |\vec{B}|)$, where we have used our assumption $|b^2| \ll m^2$. It follows that the components of $\epsilon_{\mu\nu}$ are $\mathcal{O}(|\vec{B}|/m) \ll 1$, which establishes the desired result.

We have seen above that the $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ map leaves unchanged the $\pm$ label of the plane-wave frequencies, at least for lightlike and spacelike b^μ . We now need to study the behavior of the a label under this map. The eigenvalue equation for Ω_a reads

$$\left[\frac{i}{2} \gamma_5 \sigma_{\mu\nu} b^\mu (\lambda_a^\pm)^\nu + \Omega_a \right] w_a^\pm(\vec{\lambda}) = 0. \quad (44)$$

Since $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ just inserts an additional plane-wave exponential into the position-space eigenspinors, the eigenvalue equation changes under $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ according to $(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu \rightarrow (\Lambda_{a'}^\pm)^\mu$. In the case when $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ connects two models with nontrivial b^μ , we also need to take $b^\mu \rightarrow (1 + \xi) b^\mu$ in the expression for $W \cdot b$. Then, the mapped eigenvalue $\Omega'_{a'}$ is given by

$$\left[\frac{i}{2} \gamma_5 \sigma_{\mu\nu} (1 + \xi) b^\mu (\Lambda_{a'}^\pm)^\nu + \Omega'_{a'} \right] w_a^\pm(\vec{\lambda}) = 0. \quad (45)$$

Comparison of the two eigenvalue equations (44) and (45) implies

$$\Omega'_{a'} = (1 + \xi) \left(\Omega_a - \frac{1}{2} \xi b^2 \right), \quad (46)$$

where we have used Eq. (37). The value of $(1 + \xi)$ maybe positive or negative, but it is fixed and does not change, e.g., along on a branch. So if we can show that Ω_a dominates the right-hand side of Eq. (46), it will determine the sign of $\Omega'_{a'}$. In the lightlike b^μ case, this feature is clear, and for timelike b^μ , the aforementioned difficulties arise. The discussion in the previous paragraph implies $\Omega_a \geq \frac{1}{2} |\vec{B}|(m - |\vec{B}|)$ for $b^\mu = (0, \vec{B})$. It follows that the dominance of Ω_a is also assured for spacelike b^μ .

The above results establish that $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ maps an a branch to a single other branch. But one might wonder why the other branch has a different label $a' \neq a$ when $(1+\xi) < 0$. The explanation for this fact is simple. With respect to a fixed b^μ , the spin alignment actually remains fixed under $\mathcal{R}_\xi$, i.e., the spin stays either parallel or antiparallel to b^μ . However, $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ replaces $b^\mu \rightarrow (1+\xi)b^\mu$, so that the projection axis (and not the spin) reverses direction for $(1+\xi) < 0$. This leads to different signs for $\Omega'_{a'}$ and Ω_a .

As mentioned above, we must slightly modify Eq. (46) when either the domain or the range of the $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ map involves the space $\mathcal{S}_0$ of solutions to the conventional Dirac equation. For example, $\xi = -1$ maps a model with a non-trivial b^μ to the usual Dirac case, but then the right-hand side of Eq. (46) vanishes. This issue arises due to the mapping $W \cdot b \rightarrow (1+\xi)W \cdot b$ in the above derivation of Eq. (46). For mappings between $\mathcal{S}_0$ and $\mathcal{S}_b$, we may instead choose to leave $W \cdot b$ unchanged. We then obtain

$$\Omega'_{a'} = \Omega_a \pm \frac{1}{2} b^2, \quad (47)$$

where the upper and lower signs refer to the cases with $\mathcal{S}_0$ as the range or domain, respectively.

Momenta map is bijective for each branch. As claimed, we have demonstrated above that $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ maps branches to branches, at least for lightlike and spacelike b^μ . This essentially establishes the invertibility of $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ with regards to the spinor degrees of freedom. It remains to study the $\vec{\lambda}$ -momentum degrees of freedom, a task that can now be performed branch by branch. The momentum map is given by Eq. (37), and we need to show that it is onto and invertible. The timelike b^μ case must again be excluded. For a lightlike b^μ , Eq. (40) emerges and clearly shows that the map is onto. The map also implies that $b \cdot \lambda_a^\pm = b \cdot \Lambda_a^\pm$, which ensures invertibility.

For spacelike b^μ , we need to study the second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (41), which is given by $\epsilon^{\mu\nu}(\lambda_a^\pm)_\nu$. We have established earlier that $\epsilon^{\mu\nu}$ is a correction suppressed by at least $|\vec{B}|/m$. Moreover, $\epsilon^{\mu\nu}$ is smooth, so that the map (41) must be onto. When $(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu$ satisfies the usual dispersion relation $\lambda_a^{\pm 2} = m^2$, the Jacobian for the map (41) is given by

$$\left| \frac{\partial(\Lambda_a^\pm)^i}{\partial \lambda^j} \right| = \left(1 + (-1)^a \frac{\vec{B}^2}{\sqrt{(\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{B})^2 + m^2 \vec{B}^2}} \right)^2. \quad (48)$$

Since this Jacobian is strictly nonzero, the map (41) is invertible, and thus bijective in this situation. More general mappings $b^\mu \rightarrow (1+\xi)b^\mu$ for nonzero b^μ can always be decomposed as $b^\mu \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow (1+\xi)b^\mu$, where each step is bijective by the above result. It follows that bijectivity is also guaranteed for arbitrary spacelike b^μ .

Explicit expression for inverse map. The above analysis has shown that for both lightlike and spacelike b^μ the mapping generated by $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ is bijective. This implies $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ has an inverse $\mathcal{R}_\xi^{-1}$. In cases not involving the usual

Dirac model with $\mathcal{S}_0$, it is natural to expect that $\mathcal{R}_\xi^{-1} = \mathcal{R}_{\xi'}$, where ξ' is defined by $(1+\xi')(1+\xi) = 1$:

$$(\mathcal{R}_\xi)^{-1} = \mathcal{R}_{-\xi/(1+\xi)}. \quad (49)$$

In situations with $\mathcal{S}_0$, either as the domain or the range, we anticipate

$$\begin{aligned} (R_1)^{-1} &= R_{-1}, \\ (R_{-1})^{-1} &= R_1, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where R_1 generates $\mathcal{S}_b$ from the conventional $\mathcal{S}_0$. We may verify Eqs. (49) and (50) by demonstrating that $(R)^{-1}R\psi_{a\pm}^\lambda = \psi_{a\pm}^\lambda$ holds for any plane-wave eigenspinor $\psi_{a\pm}^\lambda(x) = w_a^\pm(\vec{\lambda}) \exp(-ix\lambda_a^\pm)$ in the appropriate $\mathcal{S}_b$ or $\mathcal{S}_0$. In other words, we have to show that the frequency label $\pm$, the spin label a , and the wave 4-vector $\lambda_a^\pm$ remain unchanged under $(R)^{-1}R$.

We first note that the frequency label $\pm$ is indeed unaffected by the map $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ for any ξ , as established earlier in this section. If either the domain or the range of $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ involves the conventional Dirac space $\mathcal{S}_0$, the result (47) shows that the spin label a is also left unaffected by $\mathcal{R}_\xi$. In all other cases, Eq. (46) holds. The twofold iteration of this equation appropriate in the present situation proves that the label a is invariant under $R_{-\xi/(1+\xi)}\mathcal{R}_\xi$, as desired.

For the plane-wave vector, we want to invert

$$(\Lambda_a)^\mu = (\lambda_a)^\mu \pm \frac{b^2(\lambda_a)^\mu - (\lambda_a \cdot b)b^\mu}{2\Omega_a}, \quad (51)$$

in situations involving the usual Dirac case. Here, the upper (lower) sign refers to the case with $\mathcal{S}_0$ as the range (domain). One can check that indeed

$$(\lambda_a)^\mu = (\Lambda_a)^\mu \mp \frac{b^2(\Lambda_a)^\mu - (\Lambda_a \cdot b)b^\mu}{2\Omega'_a}, \quad (52)$$

as anticipated. For all other maps, i.e., those not involving the conventional Dirac model, we seek to invert

$$(\Lambda_a)^\mu = (\lambda_a)^\mu - \xi \frac{b^2(\lambda_a)^\mu - (\lambda_a \cdot b)b^\mu}{2\Omega_a}. \quad (53)$$

One can again verify that our expectation

$$(\lambda_a)^\mu = (\Lambda_a)^\mu + \frac{\xi}{1+\xi} \frac{b^2(\Lambda_a)^\mu - (\Lambda_a \cdot b)b^\mu}{2\Omega'_a} \quad (54)$$

is correct, which establishes Eqs. (49) and (50).

Bottom line. For lightlike and spacelike b^μ we have now explicit expressions for a b^μ -shift operator $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ and its inverse. This operator connects solutions of two b^μ models with parameters b^μ and $(1+\xi)b^\mu$ in a one-to-one fashion. In particular, it is possible to map a b^μ model to the conventional Dirac case, and vice versa. A composition of two b^μ -shift operators can thus be used to map a b^μ model to a $\tilde{b}^\mu$ model via $b^\mu \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \tilde{b}^\mu$ for any coefficients $b^2, \tilde{b}^2 \leq 0$. We remark that even though a single $\mathcal{R}_\xi$

maps a plane-wave eigenspinor in one model to a single plane-wave eigenspinor in another model, the above composition of $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ operators will typically generate a linear superposition of eigenspinors. This arises because a single $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ only scales the spin-quantization axis b^μ , whereas a composition involving $\mathcal{S}_0$ can change the direction of b^μ , and thus lead to new spin-projection states.

The $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ map can be viewed as a field redefinition. An example of another field redefinition discussed in the literature [3] is $\psi(x) \rightarrow e^{-ia \cdot x} \psi(x)$. This field redefinition does not only remove a^μ from the free a^μ model, but also from one-flavor QED. Such a generalization is possible because $\psi(x) \rightarrow e^{-ia \cdot x} \psi(x)$ has two key properties. First, the a^μ field redefinition is also defined off-shell. Second, it leaves the current $j^\mu = \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \psi$, and thus the coupling to electrodynamics, unchanged. Our $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ field redefinition does not seem to exhibit these properties in general. First, the action of $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ is only defined on $\mathcal{S}_b$, where b^μ is lightlike, spacelike, or vanishing. But interactions would require an off-shell extension of the $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ map. However, such an extension may face obstacles similar to those encountered in Secs. IV and V for timelike b^μ . Second, the current $j^\mu = \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \psi$, and thus the coupling to electrodynamics, is altered by $\mathcal{R}_\xi$. It therefore follows that b^μ cannot be removed from QED. It is, in fact, physical and can in principle be measured. However, $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ does have other applications in the free b^μ model, one of which is discussed in the next section.

VI. EXPLICIT EIGENSPINORS

The b^μ -model generalizations of various key features of the usual free Dirac case are known. Instances of these are the dispersion relation, the energy-momentum tensor, certain expressions for spinor projectors, and the Feynman propagator [3, 38]. The determination of other generalizations is often hampered by the complexity that arises through the inclusion of Lorentz violation. The momentum eigenspinors for the b^μ model are one such example. Besides approximations, only the eigenspinors for $b^\mu = (B, \vec{0})$ have been obtained [3]. In this section, we determine the momentum eigenspinors for lightlike and spacelike b^μ . To this end, we employ the $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ operator to map the known eigenspinors in the conventional Dirac case to those of the desired b^μ model.

Conventional eigenspinors. The conventional momentum-space eigenspinors obey $(\chi_a^\pm - m)w_a^\pm(\vec{\lambda}) = 0$. We may take $w_a^\pm(\vec{\lambda}) = (\chi_a^\pm + m)W_a^\pm$, where $W_a^\pm$ is an arbitrary spinor [37]. Since we have $(\chi_a^\pm - m)(\chi_a^\pm + m) = \lambda_a^{\pm 2} - m^2 = 0$, this ansatz satisfies the above defining equation for $w_a^\pm(\vec{\lambda})$. The choice

$$W_a^+ = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_a \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_a^- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \chi_a \end{pmatrix} \quad (55)$$

ensures that $w_a^\pm(\vec{\lambda})$ is nonzero. Here, ϕ_a and χ_a are non-vanishing, but otherwise arbitrary two-component spinors. In the Dirac representation for the gamma matrices, we obtain explicitly

$$w_a^+(\vec{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m(E+m)}} \begin{pmatrix} (E+m)\phi_a \\ (\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{\sigma})\phi_a \end{pmatrix}, \quad w_a^-(\vec{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m(E+m)}} \begin{pmatrix} -(\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{\sigma})\chi_a \\ (E+m)\chi_a \end{pmatrix}, \quad (56)$$

where we have set $E = (\lambda_a^+)^0 = -(\lambda_a^-)^0 = \sqrt{m^2 + \vec{\lambda}^2}$. The factor $1/\sqrt{2m(E+m)}$ has been included for normalization. These spinors satisfy the orthogonality relations

$$w_a^{\pm\dagger}(\vec{\lambda}) w_{a'}^\mp(\vec{\lambda}) = 0, \quad w_a^{\pm\dagger}(\vec{\lambda}) w_{a'}^\pm(\vec{\lambda}) = \frac{E}{m} \delta_{aa'}, \quad (57)$$

if ϕ_a and χ_a are chosen such that $\phi_a^\dagger \phi_{a'} = \chi_a^\dagger \chi_{a'} = \delta_{aa'}$. The analogous relations involving the Dirac conjugate spinors $\bar{w}_a^\pm = w_a^{\pm\dagger} \gamma^0$ are

$$\bar{w}_a^\pm(\vec{\lambda}) w_{a'}^\mp(-\vec{\lambda}) = 0, \quad \bar{w}_a^\pm(\vec{\lambda}) w_{a'}^\pm(-\vec{\lambda}) = \pm \delta_{aa'}. \quad (58)$$

We remark in passing that the second of these equations may also be written as $\bar{w}_a^\pm(\vec{\lambda}) w_{a'}^\pm(\vec{\lambda}) = \pm \delta_{aa'}$. Our sign choice in Eq. (58) becomes the natural one after the usual reinterpretation of the negative-energy solutions.

We intend to map the conventional spinors (56) to a Lorentz-violating model with coefficient $b^\mu = (b^0, \vec{b})$. It is therefore convenient to use the remaining freedom in ϕ_a and χ_a to require the $w_a^\pm(\vec{\lambda})$ spinors to be eigenstates of $W \cdot b$. For the positive-frequency solutions, the upper two components of the $W \cdot b$ eigenvalue equation give

$$(\vec{n}_+ \cdot \vec{\sigma}) \phi_a = (-1)^a \phi_a. \quad (59)$$

Here, we have used Eq. (13), and we have defined

$$\vec{n}_+ \equiv \frac{m(E+m)\vec{b} - (\lambda \cdot b + b^0 m)\vec{\lambda}}{\sqrt{(\lambda \cdot b)^2 - m^2 b^2} (E+m)}. \quad (60)$$

One can check that $\vec{n}_+$ has unit length and that the equation for the lower two components can be derived from Eq. (59), as required by consistency. It follows that ϕ_a must be the eigenvector $\phi_a(\vec{n}_+)$ of $\vec{n}_+ \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ with eigenvalue $(-1)^a$. If the spherical-polar angles that $\vec{n}_+$ subtends are specified as (θ, φ) , then we have explicitly:

$$\phi_1(\vec{n}_+) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\varphi} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\cos \frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \phi_2(\vec{n}_+) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \\ e^{i\varphi} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (61)$$

An analogous reasoning for the negative-frequency spinors yields $\chi_a = \chi_a(\vec{n}_-)$, where

$$\vec{n}_- \equiv -\frac{m(E+m)\vec{b} - (\lambda \cdot b - b^0 m)\vec{\lambda}}{\sqrt{(\lambda \cdot b)^2 - m^2 b^2} (E+m)}. \quad (62)$$

Eigenspinors for b^μ model. We can now employ $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ to map these conventional momentum-space eigenspinors

to those for a b^μ model. Equation (39) shows that the conventional spinors also satisfy the b^μ model, but at a different momentum determined by $\mathcal{R}_\xi$. Hence, the remaining task is to express the conventional-case $\vec{\lambda}$ in terms of the b^μ -model momentum $\Lambda_a^\pm$. The appropriate transformations are the lower-sign relations in Eqs. (51) and (52). To determine compact and explicit expressions for the $\mathcal{S}_b$ momentum-space spinors, we write Eq. (52) in the form

$$\lambda_a^\pm = \Lambda_a^\pm + \delta_a^\pm, \quad (63)$$

where

$$(\delta_a^\pm)^\mu \equiv (-1)^a \frac{b^2(\Lambda_a^\pm)^\mu - (\Lambda_a^\pm \cdot b) b^\mu}{\sqrt{(\Lambda_a^\pm \cdot b)^2 - b^2 \Lambda_a^{\pm 2}}}. \quad (64)$$

The b^μ -model momentum-space spinors $W_a^\pm(\vec{\Lambda})$ are then given by $W_a^\pm(\vec{\Lambda}) = w_a^\pm(\vec{\Lambda} + \vec{\delta}_a^\pm)$. We explicitly obtain for these spinors:

$$W_a^+(\vec{\Lambda}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{m + (\Lambda_a^+)^0 + (\delta_a^+)^0} \phi_a(\vec{N}_+^a) \\ \frac{(\vec{\Lambda} + \vec{\delta}_a^+) \cdot \vec{\sigma}}{\sqrt{m + (\Lambda_a^+)^0 + (\delta_a^+)^0}} \phi_a(\vec{N}_+^a) \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_a^-(\vec{\Lambda}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{-(\vec{\Lambda} + \vec{\delta}_a^-) \cdot \vec{\sigma}}{\sqrt{m - (\Lambda_a^-)^0 - (\delta_a^-)^0}} \chi_a(\vec{N}_-^a) \\ \sqrt{m - (\Lambda_a^-)^0 - (\delta_a^-)^0} \chi_a(\vec{N}_-^a) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (65)$$

Here, the vectors $\vec{N}_+^a$ and $\vec{N}_-^a$ are given by

$$\vec{N}_\pm^a = \pm \frac{m[m \pm (\Lambda_a^\pm)^0 \pm (\delta_a^\pm)^0] \vec{b} - (\Lambda_a^\pm \cdot b \pm b^0 m)(\vec{\Lambda} + \vec{\delta}_a^\pm)}{\sqrt{(\Lambda_a^\pm \cdot b)^2 - m^2 b^2} (m \pm (\Lambda_a^\pm)^0 \pm (\delta_a^\pm)^0)}. \quad (66)$$

For lightlike b^μ , we have $(\delta_a^\pm)^\mu = -(-1)^a \text{sgn}(\Lambda_a^\pm \cdot b) b^\mu$, so that in this case the b^μ -model momentum-space spinors take a relatively simply form.

Orthogonality relations in the b^μ model. Let us finally comment on the orthogonality relations for $W_a^\pm(\vec{\Lambda})$. Employing Eq. (51), we may express $\vec{\Lambda}$ in terms of $\vec{\lambda}$ and write

$$W_a^\pm(\vec{\Lambda} - \vec{\kappa}_a^\pm) = w_a^\pm(\vec{\Lambda}), \quad (67)$$

where

$$(\kappa_a^\pm)^\mu \equiv (-1)^a \frac{b^2(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu - (\lambda_a^\pm \cdot b) b^\mu}{\sqrt{(\lambda_a^\pm \cdot b)^2 - m^2 b^2}}. \quad (68)$$

For notational consistency, we rename $\vec{\lambda} \rightarrow \vec{\Lambda}$, which entails $(\lambda_a^\pm)^0 \rightarrow \pm \sqrt{m^2 + \vec{\Lambda}^2} \neq (\Lambda_a^\pm)^0$. In what follows, the dependence of $\kappa_a^\pm$ on $\vec{\Lambda}$ is understood. The results of the mapping of the conventional orthogonality relations (57) and (58) to the b^μ -model relations are now given by:

$$W_a^{\pm\dagger}(\vec{\Lambda} - \vec{\kappa}_a^\pm) W_{a'}^\mp(\vec{\Lambda} - \vec{\kappa}_{a'}^\mp) = 0, \\ W_a^{\pm\dagger}(\vec{\Lambda} - \vec{\kappa}_a^\pm) W_{a'}^\pm(\vec{\Lambda} - \vec{\kappa}_{a'}^\pm) = \frac{\sqrt{m^2 + \vec{\Lambda}^2}}{m} \delta_{aa'}, \quad (69)$$

and

$$\overline{W}_a^\pm(\vec{\Lambda} - \vec{\kappa}_{a,\vec{\Lambda}}^\pm) W_{a'}^\mp(-\vec{\Lambda} - \vec{\kappa}_{a',-\vec{\Lambda}}^\mp) = 0, \\ \overline{W}_a^\pm(\vec{\Lambda} - \vec{\kappa}_{a,\vec{\Lambda}}^\pm) W_{a'}^\pm(-\vec{\Lambda} - \vec{\kappa}_{a',-\vec{\Lambda}}^\pm) = \pm \delta_{aa'}. \quad (70)$$

For clarity, we have made explicit the dependence of $\kappa_a^\pm$ on $\vec{\Lambda}$ in Eq. (70).

The four non-vanishing relations in the second line of Eq. (69) involve scalar products of two spinors with the *same* momentum argument. It follows that in these four equations we may shift the momentum arguments to obtain simpler, more conventional expressions. However, the other orthogonality relations involve spinors with *differing* momentum arguments. The question arises if these relations would also hold at equal momentum arguments. For Eq. (70), this is not the case [3]. On the other hand, the vanishing relations in Eq. (69) do possess an equal-argument analogue: they are eigenvectors of the momentum-space Hamiltonian, and as such they are orthogonal for any fixed $\vec{\Lambda}$. A possible degeneracy of the eigenenergies does not invalidate this conclusion. With our assumption $b^2 \ll m^2$, such a degeneracy is impossible for eigenenergies with differing $\pm$ labels. For energy degeneracies between states with differing a label, the corresponding spinors are orthogonal by virtue of being eigenvectors of $W \cdot b$. We thus have

$$W_a^{\pm\dagger}(\vec{\Lambda}) W_{a'}^\mp(\vec{\Lambda}) = 0, \\ W_a^{\pm\dagger}(\vec{\Lambda}) W_{a'}^\pm(\vec{\Lambda}) = \frac{\sqrt{m^2 + (\vec{\Lambda} + \vec{\kappa}_a^\pm)^2}}{m} \delta_{aa'}. \quad (71)$$

We remark that the above induced spinor normalization differs from the choice in Refs. [3, 34, 38]. This is, how-

ever, acceptable because observables do not depend on the choice of normalization [39]. We also note that starting from Eq. (71) and mapping back to $\mathcal{S}_0$ produces orthogonality relations for the conventional Dirac case. They are nontrivial, i.e., involve differing momentum arguments, for the vanishing relations in Eq. (71).

VII. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

The present work has initiated the study of a novel type of field redefinitions within the Lorentz- and CPT-violating SME. As opposed to previously known SME field redefinitions, the mappings considered here involved infinitely many derivatives and integrations, a feature associated with non-locality.

In the context of the Lorentz-violating b^μ model, we have constructed a non-local operator $\mathcal{R}_\xi$, given by Eq. (21), that induces an on-shell field redefinition, such that the redefined field satisfies an equation of motion with a scaled coefficient $(1 + \xi)b^\mu$. For lightlike and spacelike b^μ , this field redefinition is bijective. The special choice $\xi = -1$ therefore permits the removal of Lorentz violation from the free b^μ model for $b^2 \leq 0$. As for other field redefinitions considered in the literature, $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ cannot in general be applied in interacting models.

The significance of the $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ map lies in the fact, that it establishes a one-to-one correspondence between the Lorentz-violating b^μ model and the conventional Dirac case for $b^2 \leq 0$. This permits the determination and complete characterization of the solutions to the b^μ model, which is a prerequisite for many phenomenological studies including perturbation theory. As an example of this idea, we have constructed the previously unknown explicit momentum-space eigenspinors of the b^μ model and their generalized orthogonality relations. These results are contained in Eq. (65) and Eqs. (69)–(71).

The present work has opened several avenues for further research. For instance, it would be interesting to establish whether $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ possesses an off-shell extension. Such an extension would allow theoretical studies in an interacting model. Another example for future investigations is the determination of $\mathcal{R}_\xi$ -type on-shell maps for other Lorentz-violating SME coefficients. This would yield the full characterization of solutions to the corresponding free SME sector. Finally, the spinor analysis in Sec. VI could be extended to other conventional features and their Lorentz-violating analogues in the b^μ model.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Roman Jackiw for discussions. This work is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under cooperative research agreement No. DE-FG02-05ER41360 and by the European Commission under Grant No. MOIF-CT-2005-008687.

APPENDIX A: DISPERSION-RELATION ROOTS

The dispersion relation (7) constitutes a fourth-order equation in the plane-wave frequency λ^0 . In the three canonical coordinate systems associated with a lightlike, spacelike, and timelike b^μ , the roots of this equation take a relatively simple form [3]. Moreover, the particle (antiparticle) interpretations of these roots are known [3]. Here, we list these results and adjust the a label to be consistent with our convention involving Ω_a .

Lightlike b^μ . We select a coordinate system with $b^\mu = (B, \vec{B})$, where $|B| = |\vec{B}|$. In this frame, we obtain

$$(\lambda_a^\pm)^0 = \pm \sqrt{m^2 + [\vec{\lambda} \mp (-1)^a \vec{B} \text{sgn} B]^2} \pm (-1)^a |B| \quad (\text{A1})$$

for the roots of Eq. (7). Here, $a = 1, 2$ labels the $W \cdot b$ eigenvalue Ω_a , which obeys the general relation (9). To verify the correct labelling, we need to show that $\Omega_{a=1}$ ($\Omega_{a=2}$) is negative (positive). Using the result (A1) in Eq. (15) yields $2\Omega_a = B^2 \mp (-1)^a \vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{B} \text{sgn} B + (-1)^a |B| \sqrt{m^2 + [\vec{\lambda} \mp (-1)^a \vec{B} \text{sgn} B]^2}$. If the square-root term dominates the two other terms on the right-hand side, its sign determines that of Ω_a , and the correct choice of labels is confirmed. To see this, we start with $(\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{B})^2 < B^2 \vec{\lambda}^2 + m^2 B^2$, which always holds for $m^2 B^2 \neq 0$. Adding $B^4 \mp 2(-1)^a B^2 \vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{B} \text{sgn} B$ to both sides of this inequality and completing the squares gives $(B^2 \mp (-1)^a \vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{B} \text{sgn} B)^2 < B^2 (m^2 + [\vec{\lambda} \mp (-1)^a \vec{B} \text{sgn} B]^2)$, which establishes the claim.

Spacelike b^μ . We choose our coordinate system such that $b^\mu = (0, \vec{B})$ with $|B| = |\vec{B}|$. We then find

$$(\lambda_a^\pm)^0 = \pm \sqrt{\vec{\lambda}^2 + m^2 + B^2 + 2(-1)^a \sqrt{m^2 B^2 + (\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{B})^2}} \quad (\text{A2})$$

for the dispersion-relation solutions in this frame. It remains to verify that $a = 1$ and $a = 2$ lead to negative and positive Ω_a , respectively. Employing the roots (A2) in Eq. (15), we obtain $2\Omega_a = (-1)^a \sqrt{m^2 B^2 + (\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{B})^2} + B^2$. The square-root term dominates the right-hand side and therefore determines the sign of Ω_a . This fact, which confirms the correct labeling, can be seen as follows. The lowest value $m|B|$ of the square root must be compared to the B^2 term. Since we are interested in small Lorentz violation $|b^2| \ll m^2$, we indeed have $B^2 \ll mB$.

Timelike b^μ . We will work in coordinates with $b^\mu = (B, \vec{0})$, which yields

$$(\lambda_a^\pm)^0 = \pm \sqrt{[|\vec{\lambda}| + (-1)^a |B|]^2 + m^2}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where again $a = 1, 2$. These dispersion-relation roots together with Eq. (15) imply $2\Omega_a = (-1)^a |B| |\vec{\lambda}|$ confirming consistent labeling.

APPENDIX B: INVERTIBILITY OF $W \cdot b$

To study the invertibility of $W \cdot b$ on $\mathcal{S}_b$ and $\mathcal{S}_0$, we employ the eigenvalues (9) of this operator together with the appropriate dispersion relation. If the eigenvalues remain nonzero for all $(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu(\vec{\lambda})$, $W \cdot b$ is invertible. Thus,

$$(\lambda_a^\pm \cdot b)^2 = \lambda_a^{\pm 2} b^2 \quad (\text{B1})$$

needs to be investigated: if it is satisfied for some $\lambda_\mu(\vec{\lambda})$, $(W \cdot b)^{-1}$ is singular. In what follows, we separately consider the cases of lightlike, spacelike, and timelike b^μ .

Lightlike b^μ . We choose a coordinate system with $b^\mu = (B, \vec{B})$, where $|B| = |\vec{B}|$. In the usual Dirac case, the formula (B1) gives $B^2[\pm(m^2 + \vec{\lambda}^2)^{1/2} - |\vec{\lambda}| \cos \alpha]^2 = 0$, which cannot be satisfied for real $\vec{\lambda}$. In the nonzero b^μ case with roots (A1), the requirement (B1) can be cast into the following form: $m^2 + \vec{\lambda}^2 \sin^2 \alpha = 0$, which again has no physical solutions. We conclude that for $b^2 = 0$, $W \cdot b$ is invertible on both $\mathcal{S}_b$ and $\mathcal{S}_0$.

Spacelike b^μ . We select a coordinate system with $b^\mu = (0, \vec{B})$. For ordinary Dirac fermions, the singularity condition (B1) gives $(\lambda_a^\pm \cdot b)^2 + \vec{B}^2 m^2 = 0$, which cannot be satisfied for real quantities. We now turn our attention to the b^μ model with dispersion-relation roots (A2). This equation together with the requirement (B1) leads to the relation $(\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{B})^2 + \vec{B}^2(m^2 - \vec{B}^2) = 0$. On phenomenological grounds, $m^2 \gg \vec{B}^2$ implying that physical solutions of this equation are impossible. We obtain the result that for $b^2 < 0$, $W \cdot b$ is invertible on $\mathcal{S}_b$ and $\mathcal{S}_0$.

Timelike b^μ . We will work in coordinates with $b^\mu = (B, \vec{0})$. The singularity requirement (B1) takes then the simple form $\vec{\lambda}^2 = 0$ for arbitrary $(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu$. This equation can be satisfied in both of the cases we are interested in. It follows that for $b^2 > 0$, the operator $W \cdot b$ fails to be invertible on the subspace spanned by plane waves of vanishing 3-momentum $\vec{\lambda}$. Note that b^μ and $(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu$ are aligned in such cases, a result expected from the anti-symmetric $\sigma^{\mu\nu}$ in the definition of $W \cdot b$.

-
- [1] V.A. Kostelecký, ed., *CPT and Lorentz Symmetry III*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2005; *CPT and Lorentz Symmetry II*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2002; *CPT and Lorentz Symmetry*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1999.
 - [2] R. Bluhm, arXiv:hep-ph/0506054; D. Mattingly, Living Rev. Rel. **8**, 5 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0502097]; G. Amelino-Camelia *et al.*, AIP Conf. Proc. **758**, 30 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0501053];
 - [3] D. Colladay and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 6760 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ph/9703464].
 - [4] D. Colladay and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 116002 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9809521].
 - [5] V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 105009 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0312310].
 - [6] S.M. Carroll, G.B. Field, and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 1231 (1990); J. Lipa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 060403 (2003) [arXiv:physics/0302093]; H. Müller *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 020401 (2003) [arXiv:physics/0305117]; P. Wolf *et al.*, Gen. Rel. Grav. **36**, 2352 (2004) [arXiv:gr-qc/0401017]; Phys. Rev. D **70**, 051902 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0407232]; M.E. Tobar *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 025004 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0408006]; P.L. Stanwix *et al.*, arXiv:gr-qc/0609072; S. Herrmann *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 150401 (2005) [arXiv:physics/0508097]; V.A. Kostelecký and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 251304 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0111026]; Phys. Rev. Lett. (in press) [arXiv:hep-ph/0607084].
 - [7] R. Jackiw and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3572 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9901358]; M. Pérez-Victoria, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2518 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9905061]; V.A. Kostelecký and A.G.M. Pickering, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 031801 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0212382]; B. Altschul, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 101701 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0407172].
 - [8] C. Adam and F.R. Klinkhamer, Nucl. Phys. B **657**, 214 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0212028]; T. Jacobson, S. Liberati, and D. Mattingly, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 124011 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0209264]; V.A. Kostelecký and A.G.M. Pickering, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 031801 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0212382]; R. Lehnert, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 085003 (2003) [arXiv:gr-qc/0304013]; R. Lehnert and R. Potting, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 110402 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0406128]; Phys. Rev. D **70**, 125010 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0408285]; F.R. Klinkhamer and C. Rupp, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 017901 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0506071]; C. Kaufhold and F.R. Klinkhamer, Nucl. Phys. B **734**, 1 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0508074]; B. Altschul, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 085003 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0507258]; Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 201101 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0603138]; arXiv:hep-th/0609030; B. Feng *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 221302 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0601095]; C.D. Carone, M. Sher, and M. Vanderhaeghen, arXiv:hep-ph/0609150.
 - [9] V.A. Kostelecký and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 056005 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0205211].
 - [10] H. Dehmelt *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4694 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9906262]; R. Mittleman *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2116 (1999); G. Gabrielse *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3198 (1999); R. Bluhm *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1432 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ph/9707364]; Phys. Rev. D **57**, 3932 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9809543]; Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2254 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9810269].
 - [11] L.-S. Hou, W.-T. Ni, and Y.-C.M. Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 201101 (2003) [arXiv:physics/0009012]; R. Bluhm and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1381 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9912542]; B.R. Heckel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 021603 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0606218].
 - [12] V.A. Kostelecký, C.D. Lane and A.G.M. Pickering, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 056006 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0111123]; H. Müller *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 116006 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0401016]; Phys. Rev. D **70**, 076004 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0405177]; H. Müller, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 045004 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0412385].
 - [13] D. Bear *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 5038 (2000) [arXiv:physics/0007049]; D.F. Phillips *et al.*, Phys. Rev.

- D **63**, 111101 (2001) [arXiv:physics/0008230]; M.A. Humphrey *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 063405 (2000) [arXiv:physics/0007056]; Phys. Rev. A **68**, 063807 (2003); F. Canè *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 230801 (2004) [arXiv:physics/0309070]; P. Wolf *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 060801 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0601024]; V.A. Kostelecký and C.D. Lane, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 116010 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9908504]; C.D. Lane, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 016005 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0505130].
- [14] R. Bluhm *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 090801 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0111141]; Phys. Rev. D **68**, 125008 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0306190].
- [15] O. Bertolami *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **395**, 178 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ph/9612437]; G. Lambiase, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 087702 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0510386]; J.M. Carmona *et al.*, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **21**, 883 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0410143]; S.M. Carroll and J. Shu, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 103515 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0510081].
- [16] KTeV Collaboration, H. Nguyen, in *CPT and Lorentz Symmetry II*, Ref. [1]; OPAL Collaboration, K. Ackersstaff *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **76**, 401 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ex/9707009]; DELPHI Collaboration, M. Feindt *et al.*, preprint DELPHI 97-98 CONF 80 (1997); BELLE Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3228 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ex/0011090]; BaBar Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 181801 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ex/0311037]; arXiv:hep-ex/0607103; FOCUS Collaboration, J.M. Link *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **556**, 7 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ex/0208034]; V.A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 3923 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9501341]; V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1818 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9809572]; Phys. Rev. D **61**, 016002 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9909554].
- [17] V.W. Hughes *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 111804 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ex/0106103]; R. Bluhm *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1098 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9912451].
- [18] V.D. Barger *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 5055 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/0005197]; A. de Gouvêa, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 076005 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0204077].
- [19] LSND Collaboration, L.B. Auerbach *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 076004 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ex/0506067]; M.D. Messier (SK), in *CPT and Lorentz Symmetry III*, Ref. [1]; B.J. Rebel and S.F. Mufson (MINOS), in *CPT and Lorentz Symmetry III*, Ref. [1]; V.A. Kostelecký and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 016005 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0309025]; Phys. Rev. D **70**, 031902(R) (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0308300]; Phys. Rev. D **70**, 076002 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0406255]; T. Katori *et al.*, arXiv:hep-ph/0606154.
- [20] D.L. Anderson, M. Sher, and I. Turan, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 016001 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0403116]; E.O. Iltan, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **19**, 327 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0309154].
- [21] Q.G. Bailey and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 045001 (2006) [arXiv:gr-qc/0603030].
- [22] For a related work, see, e.g., G.M. Shore, Nucl. Phys. B **717**, 86 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0409125].
- [23] V.A. Kostelecký and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 683 (1989); V.A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, Nucl. Phys. B **359**, 545 (1991). R. Bluhm and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 065008 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0412320]; B. Altschul and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Lett. B **628**, 106 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0509068]; V.A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, Gen. Rel. Grav. **37**, 1675 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0510124].
- [24] G.Yu. Bogoslovsky, arXiv:math-ph/0511077; Phys. Lett. A **350**, 5 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0511151].
- [25] See, e.g., I. Mocioiu, M. Pospelov, and R. Roiban, Phys. Lett. B **489**, 390 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/0005191]; S.M. Carroll *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 141601 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0105082]; Z. Guralnik, R. Jackiw, S.Y. Pi, and A.P. Polychronakos, Phys. Lett. B **517**, 450 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0106044]; C.E. Carlson, C.D. Carone, and R.F. Lebed, Phys. Lett. B **518**, 201 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0107291]; A. Anisimov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 085032 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0106356]; A. Das *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 107702 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0510002].
- [26] V.A. Kostelecký, R. Lehnert, and M. Perry, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 123511 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0212003]; R. Jackiw and S.-Y. Pi, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 104012 (2003) [arXiv:gr-qc/0308071]; O. Bertolami *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 083513 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0310344].
- [27] N. Arkani-Hamed *et al.*, JHEP **0507**, 029 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0407034].
- [28] J. Alfaro, H.A. Morales-Técotl, and L.F. Urrutia, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 124006 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0208192]; D. Sudarsky, L. Urrutia, and H. Vucetich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 231301 (2002) [arXiv:gr-qc/0204027]; Phys. Rev. D **68**, 024010 (2003) [arXiv:gr-qc/0211101]; G. Amelino-Camelia, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **17**, 899 (2002) [arXiv:gr-qc/0204051]; R. Myers and M. Pospelov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 211601 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0301124]; N.E. Mavromatos, Lect. Notes Phys. **669**, 245 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0407005].
- [29] F.R. Klinkhamer and J. Schimmel, Nucl. Phys. B **639**, 241 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0205038]; F.R. Klinkhamer and C. Rupp, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 045020 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0312032].
- [30] C.D. Froggatt and H.B. Nielsen, arXiv:hep-ph/0211106.
- [31] J.D. Bjorken, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 043508 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0210202].
- [32] C.P. Burgess *et al.*, JHEP **0203**, 043 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0201082]; A.R. Frey, JHEP **0304**, 012 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0301189]; J. Cline and L. Valcárcel, JHEP **0403**, 032 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0312245].
- [33] M.S. Berger and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 091701 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0112243]. D. Colladay and P. McDonald, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 3554 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0202066]; B. Altschul, arXiv:hep-th/0602235.
- [34] V.A. Kostelecký and R. Lehnert, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 065008 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0012060].
- [35] L. Cervi, L. Griguolo, and D. Seminara, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 105003 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0104022]; T. Mariz *et al.*, JHEP **0510**, 019 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0509008].
- [36] V.C. Zhukovsky, A.E. Lobanov, and E.M. Murchikova, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 065016 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0510391].
- [37] See, e.g., C. Itzykson and J.-B. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory*, (McGraw-Hill, Singapore, 1980).
- [38] R. Lehnert, J. Math. Phys. **45**, 3399 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0401084].
- [39] D. Colladay and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Lett. B **511**, 209 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0104300].
- [40] For $b^\mu \neq 0$, all dispersion-relation branches have regions with spacelike $(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu$, and one can always select frames in which part of a positive-frequency branch dips below the frequency zero and vice versa [34]. However, the sign of the *asymptotic* plane-wave frequencies $(\lambda_a^\pm)^0(|\vec{\lambda}| \rightarrow \infty)$ remains unchanged under any finite coordinate boost.